

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DONALD F. MACKAY, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-1805RAJ

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

On March 17, 2015, the court ordered Plaintiff to show cause why it should not dismiss this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court ordered Plaintiff to respond in “a written submission, to be filed no later than April 10, 2015,” in which he explained “how the amount in controversy in this case exceeds \$75,000.”

The only filing the court has received from Plaintiff since the order to show cause is an informal “amended complaint” (Dkt. # 8) in which Plaintiff reiterates his grievances with his cellular phone service. His sole mention of the amount in controversy is the assertion that he “seek[s] rel[ie]f gr[e]ater than \$75,000.”

There is no basis to believe that there is more than \$75,000 in controversy, and the court accordingly lacks subject matter jurisdiction for the reasons it explained in the order to show cause.

Plaintiff’s “amended complaint” also contains a few references to “monopoly” and “anti trust.” There is no direct indication that Plaintiff is attempting to invoke the federal

1 antitrust laws. Even if he were, however, he has offered no allegations that state an
2 antitrust claim. In a case like this one where a plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, the
3 court “shall dismiss the case” if (among other things) it determines that the plaintiff’s
4 complaint either “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” 28 U.S.C.
5 § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

6 The court dismisses this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and,
7 alternatively, because Plaintiff fails to state any federal claim upon which the court can
8 grant relief.

9 DATED this 27th day of April, 2015.

10
11 
12

13 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
14 United States District Court Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28